

this question and we should accept the answer they now give us as a final answer from them. If the opportunities of the approaching sessions of State and National legislatures are insufficient to wipe these grasping monopolies out of existence, and adopt such laws as shall forever guard against their reappearance we should be prepared at the next general election to elevate men to all positions of trust who will for no consideration betray the interests of the people. In the language of a writer to the Kansas Farmer, from Rice county:

"If any class of people would be cared for they must care for themselves and not look to or depend upon men of other pursuits to frame and enact laws to guard their interests. If they do they are sure to get just what we now have, that is, capital will be enthroned in high places and will, as in every other age of the past, prove tyrannical and become alike insensible to destitution and tears, totally disregarding the principles of justice."

Then brother farmers begin at the top and elect an overwhelming majority of your lawmakers from your own ranks beginning with the United States Senator, going all the way down to the members of your State Legislatures, and keep it up. The gross neglect upon our part to do this has in the last twenty five years increased the number of millionaires in the country from two to more than 7,000 and has placed in the possession of seventy American citizens (as stated upon good authority) \$1,413,000,000. Surely such a rapid concentration of capital, added to high rates of interest, high rates of transportation of the products of the farm and of what the farmers are compelled to have shipped them, together with the other causes enumerated in this article, is what is making the farmers poor."

We copy in another column from the Kansas City Live Stock Indicator of June 20 1889, some testimony before the Inter-State Commerce Commission, which originally appeared in the Kansas City Times, and which for some reason not clearly apparent, and surely not because it is unimportant, has failed to appear in the columns of newspapers generally, throughout the country. There are some questions suggested in connection with this matter which we believe to be pertinent, and the answers to which would be intensely interesting to farmers and stock raisers generally. The first, and not the least interesting of these is, why has this testimony been practically suppressed? Why has it not been given that wide publicity which its importance merits? The witness refused to give the names of the signers of the agreement in question, remarking that "the newspapers would make a big fuss over the agreement and denounce the signers as trust monopolists." Judge Cooley said the question was competent evidence regarding a matter of public concern.

"We cannot force you to answer if he added, 'but it will not help your cause to refuse.' We do not control the newspapers and cannot shut out the reporters."

It would appear therefore that the reporters were there and hence they cannot plead ignorance as an excuse for not giving the important facts to the public. It would be extremely interesting to know just what potent influence was instrumental in "controlling the newspapers" on this occasion.

Again. It appears that after several hours deliberation the witness rehearsed and handed a list of the names of the signers of the precious document under consideration to the Committee "under protest" which Judge Cooley is said to have "quickly glanced over and tucked in his pocket. He stated to a Times reporter later that the list would not be made public at present." Another query naturally arises here. What potent influence induced Judge Cooley to quietly pocket this list of names which he had previously declared to be "Competent evidence concerning a matter of public concern?"

Have the people of this country not only powerfully to submit to the systematic robberies of such conscienceless scoundrels as the testimony before this Committee brought to light, but also to be denied the information of their identity and of the nefarious business in which they are engaged, by the press whose business it is to enlighten the people in whatever pertains to their interests, and by Government Officials whose duty it is to protect them from such outrages?

These are questions it would be well for the people seriously to consider.

PERSONAL.

In this first issue of the ADVOCATE I deem it due both to myself and a portion of the late patrons of the Meridian to give a brief explanation of my connection with it and of its unexpected downfall. I am not a financial interest in it, nor in its success or failure. I am not in its editorial office, and I am not a proprietor. I am not a stipulated compensation, and with the understanding that I might purchase an interest at a future time if I desired to do so. When it was known that I had assumed its management, and that it would be published in the interests of the Farmers' Alliance, the District Convention by resolution adopted the paper as an official organ and many members of the Order were induced to subscribe for it with this understanding. I regarded the paper as on high road to prosperity, and had not the remotest thought that its discontinuance was contemplated. I had a large part of the copy prepared for another issue of the paper when I was informed by the proprietors that the press, type and fixtures were sold and would be moved away from the place. I regarded this as an injustice, both to myself and the Farmers' Alliance, and especially to those who had subscribed and paid for the paper a year in advance; and yet I was powerless to prevent it, and was left without means of communicating with my friends except by letter. This is my first opportunity of offering an explanation. The proprietors of the Report promised to collect their arrearages and refund to those who had paid in advance, and I believe they have been doing this probably as rapidly as possible. I desire to add that I do not hold myself responsible to any of the old subscribers who were on the list previous to May 1st, 1889, the date of my first connection with the paper; but to those who subscribed AFTER that date and paid their money in advance I hold myself in readiness to make that subscription good. If there

are any such to whom the proprietors of the Report have not returned their money, if they will notify me of the fact I will place their names on the subscription list for the ADVOCATE, and agree to give them a better paper than the one for which they subscribed. If the money should be refunded to any of these after this time I will trust to their honor to pay us for our paper hereafter. Hoping that this explanation will be satisfactory to all parties interested, I desire to solicit the continued good will of all who gave my former efforts so generous a support, of the entire membership of the Farmers' Alliance and the people of the entire community. My best efforts will continue to be directed to the promotion of what I shall conceive to be of common interest to the entire community.

S. McLELLIN.

One Source of Taxation Upon the Consumer.

"Nothing will serve this illustrative end more forcibly than the traveling salesman who is, pure and simple, an institution, or implement, of modern commercial competition. Careful estimates from a variety of reliable sources places the number of commercial travelers in this country at 250,000. Their railroad fares, express or freight upon baggage, hotel bills, and expenses range from \$4 to \$12 and more a day, averaging about \$6 daily. Salaries range upwards from \$900 a year. Thousands of men earn \$2000 and \$2500 a year; a smaller number receive salaries between \$3000 and \$5,000; while a comparatively few are paid \$15,000, and in rare instances even more. In every field of employment, the lower salaries are vastly in the majority, and \$1800 is a fair average.

Let us see what these figures will give us for the cost of this single element in competition. The expenses of 250,000 traveling salesmen at \$6 a day amount to \$1,500,000 daily, or \$547,500,000 in 365 days. Then the salaries of 250,000 traveling men averaged at \$1800 a year aggregate \$450,000,000, so that the two items of salaries and traveling expenses to be charged up against the commercial traveler amount to the astonishing total of \$997,500,000 a year. Nor is this all. In nearly every branch of business each man must be provided with his outfit of trunks, sample cases and his more or less complete line of samples.

To give accurate figures or even approximate estimates in this direction is a hopeless task and I shall not attempt it; but here are a few facts to stimulate speculation: A salesman who handles a general line of dry goods, "notions," and "small wares," requires an outfit costing from \$50 to \$200 in addition to which the samples that he carries in a single year cost from \$1000 to \$2000. Some of these samples are sold subsequently, while others become worthless, or are lost altogether. To cover losses of this character, it is customary to make allowance of thirty-three and one-third per cent, of the actual cost of the samples. Now it may readily be seen that a concern employing fifty to one hundred traveling salesmen—and there are many at the latter figure—is under an enormous expense in

reaching its customers; not to mention such minor matters as store expenses, interest upon capital etc.

And upon whom does this burden fall? Who supports this vast array of commercial warriors? Directly, the employer of course; but while he pays all these enormous expenses he does it only as the disbursing agent of the purchaser and consumer, for it is upon them that the burden must rest at last. Indeed the dry goods merchant figures: "We must allow five per cent on these goods to cover the cost of the salesman, on these it will amount to ten per cent," and so on. This is a fact, fanciful theory but actual fact. An item of over \$1,000,000,000, charged annually to the account of the merchant, is paid by the purchaser at retail, the consumer. And the expensive luxury of this form of competition brings neither advantage to the purchaser nor profit to the merchant in the long run. Were there not a traveling salesman upon the road today the aggregate sales of merchandise would be likely as large as at present, and at lower prices the merchant would reap even greater profits than he now makes."—EDWARD H. SANBORN in the Nationalist.

The United States Senate Committee on irrigation is making a tour of the West, investigating the feasibility of various plans for supplying requisite moisture to our great plains. It might be well for them to consider among other plans that proposed by Dr. Parsons of Wamego and supported by A. P. Limehouse, place. These men are not likely to advocate schemes devoid of merit. We commend their views to the favorable consideration not only of the committee but also of the people who are located upon the lands where the moisture is insufficient for agricultural purposes.

The Lawrence Tribune says: "At the closing hours of the last legislature an item was tacked to the appropriation bill that made it possible for the state labor commission to employ at a salary of \$1,000 a year, a clerk for whom there was no earthly use. The appropriation was made in order that a 'conflict of jurisdiction' between two factions might be avoided, and the man of each faction could be provided for. One C. A. Henri, was appointed to the clerkship. Will some one who can do so explain this proceeding? It is charged openly that Mr. Henri was given the position in order to close his mouth. If this is true, what does he know? No one claims that he has any particular and superior demands upon the party. Then why was a place specially prepared for him, and why was he put into it almost before the ink was dry upon the bill? It is possible that this is all right, and if it is, the explanation will not be difficult. Will the republican papers at Topeka tell the people of the state the facts in reference to the whole matter? And if they are as much in the dark as the others, will they have the kindness to say so?" He is in order for "the powers that be," now that a republican invitation has been extended, to have an explanation that will explain about the "conflict of jurisdiction" and shed some light on the "two factions" that stand ready to the Kansas labor bureau, and by "two donors" to the cause. Kansas to Wm. Council, St. Louis, Mo.